



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fw  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,932	03/08/2005	Shundo Harada	266003US3PCT	7574
22850	7590	12/08/2006	EXAMINER	
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3749	

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/526,932	HARADA ET AL.
	Examiner Stephen Gravini	Art Unit 3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 9-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                     |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a subcombination apparatus, classified in class 34, subclass 92.
- II. Claims 9-15, drawn to a subcombination apparatus, classified in class 34, subclass 85.
- III. Claims 16-20, drawn to a subcombination apparatus, classified in class 34, subclass 62.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of group I and groups II & III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination of independently claimed group I invention has separate utility such as having the feature of a liquid and splash preventing equipment having a cooling function provided in a location above a portion of a liquid concentration section between drums without the group II and III limitations of independently claimed two liquid drying drums in a chamber and a liquid feed port. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions of group II and group III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one

subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination of independently claimed group II invention has separate utility such as having the feature of a liquid and splash preventing equipment above a portion preventing passage configured to cool liquid in contact with the liquid and splash preventing passage without the group III means plus function independently claimed limitations, which may be reasonably and broadly construed consistent with the accompanying specification to not include the liquid and splash preventing equipment configuration. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Newly submitted claims 9-20 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the reasons set forth above in the restriction requirement.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 9-20 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 5 is objected to because it is dependent upon itself. Appropriate correction is required.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being Parker by (US 6,314,659). Parker is construed to disclose the claimed invention comprising:

a liquid splash and scatter preventing equipment **33, 31, 34** having a cooling function provided in a location above a portion of a liquid concentration section between drums **11**.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Rooney et al. (US 4,741,868). Parker is construed to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed cavity for feeding of a cooling liquid refrigerant. Rooney, another drum dryer, is construed to disclose a cavity for feeding of a cooling liquid refrigerant at column 5 lines 5-68. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Parker with the cavity for feeding of a cooling liquid refrigerant, construed disclosed by Rooney for the purpose of allowing cooling heat exchange in a vacuum drying process.

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Thal (US 2,087,788). Parker is construed to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed hollow metal for feeding of cooling water. Thal, another drum dryer, is construed to disclose a hollow metal for feeding of cooling water at the right column of page 2 lines 10-42 and left column of page 4 lines 40-58. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Parker with the hollow metal for feeding of cooling water, construed disclosed by Thal for the purpose of cooling material before it dries in order to avoid wasted heat.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker in view of Thal. Parker in view of Thal is construed to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed specific temperature parameters. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide one skilled in the art with specific temperature parameters, since the teachings of Parker in view of Thal would perform the invention as claimed regardless of the recited claim temperature values.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been construed but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Josiah C. Cocks can be reached on 571 272 4874. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SMG  
December 4, 2006

*Stephen Gravini*